

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners
Paradise Valley Unified District
District Administrative Center
15002 N. 32nd Street
Phoenix, AZ
March 5, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

COP MEMBERS

Julia Ayres	Joan Johnson
Christine Bejarano	Lucille Lang
Steve Chambers	Jean Lewis
Kaye Dean	Leticia Lujan
Analizabeth Doan	Norma Malamud
Shelly Duran	Patricia Marsh
Robert Edgar	Mary McIntyre
Diane Fox	Joe O'Reilly
Lannie Gillespie	Catherine Steele
Allan Grell	Julie Thayer
Connie Heath	Maureen Ward
Maureen Irr	Charlotte Wing
Marion Jewell	

ADE

Sherry Barclay
Debbie Francis
Nancy Konitzer
Tee Lambert
Carrie Larson
Cheryl Lebo
Bobbie Orlando
Muriel Rosmann
Nancy Stahl

GUESTS

Michael Pospisil

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

COP co-chairs, Maureen Irr and Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. Mary McIntyre welcomed COP members to the District Administrative Center of Paradise Valley Unified School District. Ms. McIntyre introduced Dr. Skip Brown, Assistant Superintendent for support services and planning. Dr. Brown welcomed everyone to Paradise Valley "where everyday is a day in Paradise". Dr. Brown thanked everyone for coming out in the rain, which speaks to COP member's commitment to education. Maureen then proceeded to have members introduce themselves.

MONITORING – Bobbie Orlando

Bobbie Orlando, Monitoring Manager, explained a new approach to monitoring LEAs for NCLB. A 6-year cycle is being developed to match monitoring efforts with Exceptional Student Services (ESS). Superintendent Horne wants to consolidate monitoring with other ADE departments to lessen the visits to the LEAs. ESS currently uses a 6-year cycle monitoring program and Academic Achievement is

creating a similar monitoring system. During each year different requirements will be evaluated for compliance. This will take the burden off of the LEAs trying to do everything in one year and encourage them to do annual self-assessment. Bobbie explained how each year of the 6-year monitoring cycle the LEA would address specific components of NCLB requirements. Bobbie broke the members up into small work groups and passed out a work sheet and a listing of requirements that are listed in the NCLB statutes. Their charge was to use the list and discuss which components should be addressed during specific years in the cycle. Members worked in small groups for about 10 minutes. When members finished they shared their recommendations on the NCLB 6-year cycle monitoring program. They also discussed concerns as well as suggestions. Their results are shown in *Appendix A*.

Nancy Konitzer shared that states, nation wide, are going to an integrated monitoring of federal projects. ADE is looking at how other states are addressing the same issue. Nancy also explained the training needed for new specialists to help balancing monitoring responsibilities as well as duties as a program coordinator.

IMPLICATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE – Carrie Larson

Carrie handed out an article from Education Week with an article discussing how Michigan is now dealing with 112 schools that have not met AYP for 5 years and are making plans for changes for next year for Alternative Governance. Michigan is opting to either replace school staff or other major reforms, not state take over. Pennsylvania is also in the 5th year. She then explained the timeline for schools that do not meet AYP.

Actions For Schools That Do Not Make AYP

Spring	1 st Year	2 nd Year	3 rd Year	4 th Year	5 th Year	6 th Year
Fall	No Consequences	School Improvement Plan 10% of Title I funding goes towards Professional Development Public School Choice		→ → → Add Supplemental Services → Corrective Action (Choosing from a list of options)	Restructuring Planning Year	Restructuring <i>Alternative Governance</i>

Carrie explained that schools in corrective action must report monthly. Schools must choose one corrective action from an approved listing. Under the law it is the District's responsibility to offer technical assistance and professional development opportunities to the schools.

Carrie had the members break into 5 small groups to discuss several issues of restructuring/alternative governance. The groups were given a worksheet and legal definitions of Restructuring and Alternative Governance and given a specific issue to address of the 5 different arrangements listed in the law. What are the implications? What would it look like? Would there be difference if it were a rural school vs. an urban school? They spent 20 minutes in small group and then were reconvened to share a few highlights from the issue they were assigned.

Highlights from the group discussions:

Group A. Reopening the school as a public charter school.

- ☐ In rural schools there is not a lot of choice for personnel for a charter school.
- ☐ Does governance change affect site councils?
- ☐ Composition of students might change because regulation changes would cause high mobility.
- ☐ What happens if the “new” charter school makes AYP for a couple of years? Can they rejoin their District?
- ☐ Would the school become a District charter school?
- ☐ Can this new charter school cap their enrollment?
- ☐ What if a LEA is only one school, do they just change their name?

Group B. Replacing all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) that are relevant to the failure to make AYP.

- ☐ Who should go first? Remove the principal first and change the leadership.
- ☐ Data should be used to choose who should be replaced. Which data?

Group C. Entering into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the public school.

- ☐ The schools M&O dollars would follow the charter and have negative impact to the LEA.
- ☐ ADE should recommend private management companies. Schools would not know whom they should choose.
- ☐ How would you handle the community who would not want to change, but the law says yes?

Group D. Turning the operation of the school over to the State educational agency, if permitted under State law and agreed to by the State.

- ☐ If the state took over would they work through district or local school?
- ☐ Who would handle the funding?
- ☐ Who would address the concerns about individual school’s label affecting kids and their neighborhoods?
- ☐ When dismissing personnel would the state honor the LEA contracts?
- ☐ What happens if the school still fails while under state direction?

- Group E. Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school's staffing and governance, to improve student academic achievement in the school and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make AYP as defined in the State plan under section 1111(b)(2). In case of a rural local educational agency with a total of less than 600 students in average daily attendance at the schools that are served by the agency and all of whose schools have a School Locale Code of 7 or 8, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall, at such agency's request, provide technical assistance to such agency for the purpose of implementing this clause.**
- ❑ There should be separate plans to work with schools, other than the LEA – County might be a better option instead of the State.
 - ❑ County could help work locally to bring in more resources, support and technical assistance.

SEI ENDORSEMENT – Debby Francis

Nancy Konitzer introduced Debby Francis, Title III program specialist. Debby came to share information on Structured English Immersion (SEI) endorsement requirements and to tell members that the State School Board voted to adopt rule proposal designated option 2 concerning SEI. The notice of proposed rule making is filed with the Secretary of State with opportunity for public comment, which will be on May 12, 2004 at 1:30.

Debby then explained the SEI endorsement requirements. All new K-12 who graduate August 31, 2006 or later shall be required to pass 3-credit SEI methods course, within their course of study. All state universities in Arizona and other accredited teacher preparatory programs shall offer the course.

Existing certified teachers, administrators and ELL Coordinators/Directors shall be required to obtain 1 credit hour or 15 clock hours of professional development in SEI methods by August 31, 2006. If they have an English as Second Language/Bilingual Education K-12 endorsement, they are exempt from this requirement.

By August 31, 2010 all certified teachers, administrators and ELL coordinators/directors, regardless of having an English as Second Language/Bilingual Education K-12 endorsement are required to obtain 3-credit hours or 45 clock hour of professional development to maintain their SEI endorsement.

ADE will have a task force who will develop curriculum criteria, which later will be presented to the State Board for approval. ADE is submitting a five-year grant for professional development with the Arizona K-12 Center; if the grant is awarded, the task force will be working over the summer. Their product will be presented to the State School Board for approval. If members had questions they could contact Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Title III at 602-364-2345. When the task force is formed and dates have been set, members will be notified through the list serve. This will be their chance to add input on curriculum criteria for SEI endorsement.

MEGA CONFERENCE – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy thanked the members for their input at January's COP meeting on the Mega Conference. Along with members comments and comments from the surveys from the conference ADE has decided to hold 4 separate conferences in the future. The 2004 Structured English Immersion Conference will be held at The Wigwam Resort in Litchfield Park, May 19-20, 2004. The focus will be English Immersion Strategies. June 10-11, 2004, The First Annual Quality Teaching and Learning Conference will be held at The Wigwam Resort in Litchfield Park. The topic will be: "The Highly Qualified Educator: Building a Professional Learning Community" this conference is recommended for Principals and Teachers. In the fall or early second semester will be a conference focused on Best Practices. The Mega Conference will be held in November. This conference will be for directors and program directors that will be administering NCLB programs. If members have suggestions on presenters call Nancy Konitzer at 602-542-7470.

ADE is applying for grant with the Wallace Foundation. This grant is for leadership development for leadership at the school level. To be able to develop leadership roles for teachers that want to do more but not necessarily become a principal or be part of administration. The Certification task force is also working on a tiered certification system for teachers; they are working on defining Master Teacher.

There will be a training held for NCLB in Coordinators in August after the 12th. This will be a time for LEA NCLB coordinators to get questions answered, network with each other and to gain a better understanding of the appeal process. Nancy will be forwarding items to members of NCLB issues that come from federal decisions.

A discussion took place on a change from the feds on how to count LEP students. Meeting AYP is based on success of the ELL subgroup. LEAs can appeal if there are students that have not been in a program less than 3 years. ADE is looking at changing the rule on how Arizona counts ELL students that would allow LEAs to count FEP students as ELL for 2 years after making FEP.

Nancy then informed members about business rules for SAIS being on the web for easier access. Click on SAIS, then to go to MIS Bulletin Board. www.ade.az.gov/sais/saisdbdocs.asp The SAIS changes for 2005 are also on the SAIS web page.

STATE SYSTEM OF SCHOOL SUPPORT – Nancy Konitzer

Under NCLB the ADE need to create School Support Teams. This is different than the Solution Teams that work with underperforming school under Arizona Learns. School Support Teams meet the requirements of NCLB Statute - Sec. 1117 which indicates a system for support for all Title I schools, not just schools that are in school improvement.

Nancy asked members to participate in some brainstorming ideas of what kind of areas that could be addressed with School Support Teams. The members identified the following areas that could be addressed with School Support Teams:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prevention (SIP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SW plan development | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent involvement strategies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resource allocations; school and LEA | <input type="checkbox"/> Long-term intervention |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Data Management- data driven instructions | <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SBR models (similar demographics) | |

The creation of School Support Teams allows ADE and LEAs to be proactive in helping schools improve. To align schools stated needs with monitoring procedures with technical assistance in areas that there are deficiencies. There could a coordination effort between Solutions Team and School Support Teams.

BEST PRACTICES – Cheryl Lebo

Nancy Konitzer introduced Cheryl Lebo, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Best Practices, School Effectiveness Division. Cheryl described her background of teaching and being a Principal in the Paradise Valley District before joining ADE. She introduced Eugene Judson, Research Assistant, working with Cheryl's division. Cheryl then talked about some of the projects that the School Effectiveness Division is currently working on: Best Practices and how it applies to Arizona Schools and setting up a School Resource Guide, an online site that schools and LEAs can find resources relating to leadership, curriculum and strategies and models that other LEAs and schools have implemented that have been successful.

In effort to define Best Practice, Karen Butterfield, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Innovative and Exemplary Practices, is working with the team from School Effectiveness Division. They are looking at research that will establish criteria, strategies and services that define Best Practices.

Currently, School Effectiveness Division is working on reviewing the statement of findings from the Solution Teams that have been out working with schools. Cheryl shared that there have been some common issues that the Solutions Teams are finding: principals do not know their school improvement plan, when created by an external facilitator; there is a lack of professional development; schools are not using data to drive instruction; there is a lack of regular visits to the classroom with feedback on effective strategies. These issues have created a "disconnect" from the school leadership to successful teacher effectiveness.

There has been a positive feedback on Solutions Teams being comprised of Arizona educators who have a strong background in Arizona unique needs. School Effectiveness Division will be contacting those principals of those schools that have worked with their Solution Teams. These schools will receive ongoing support from ADE, monthly contacts and quarterly contacts after second year.

Cheryl answered questions concerning Scientific Based Research standards. She explained that ADE is working on being able to define SBR standards and connecting them with demographic needs to provide easier resource information for schools and LEAs.

Maureen thanked all the members for coming to the COP Meeting in adverse weather conditions. She reminded everyone that the next meeting will be held at ASU West on May 7, 2004. Carrie Larson reminded members that membership time is coming up and that she would be contacting members if their membership term is expiring and giving them a chance to renew. The meeting was called to adjournment at 3:20 p.m.

***Committee Of Practitioners Input On the
ESS and NCLB Joint Monitoring - 6 year Cycle***

General comments:

- ❑ A compromise schedule for monitoring, perhaps there could be a “modified” system to accommodate this difference.
- ❖ Divide districts into separate groupings:
 - Large schools districts where each department usually has it’s own director - they can handle monitoring both programs at the same time.
 - Small school districts where one person wears “many hats” - they cannot handle monitoring both programs at the same time
- ❑ Provide all monitoring questions electronically to each school – they would respond electronically and the answers would be collated into a self-study at DOE for each school. Monitoring visits would then become observations to determine if the school practicing what it said it was doing. (Accreditation style self-study process)
- ❖ Electronically Submitted
 - Title I LEA Parent Policy
 - Title I School Parent Policy
 - Parent - School Compact
 - Standards Affidavits
 - Parent Request policy re: HQ teachers
 - 4 week notice – teacher is currently not HQ
 - Homeless students policies
 - ELL parent notices (1112(g))
 - School improvement notices
 - Choice options
 - Supplemental services
 - Principal’s attestation of HQ teachers
 - Private school services
 - Poverty criteria – rank ordering
 - TA schools – criteria for services
 - SW – supplementary programs
 - Comparability
 - School prayer policy
 - Set asides (1113(c))

- ☐ A different timeline was offered for consideration.

<i>Year 1</i>	<i>Year 2</i>	<i>Year 3</i>	<i>Year 4</i>	<i>Year 5</i>	<i>Year 6</i>
Policies and Procedures Submitted Title I —————→ Title III —————→ Homeless —————→ Poverty —————→ HQ Teachers —————→	Procedures Implemented Policies and Procedures Title II —————→ Title IV —————→ Title V —————→ <i>LEA develop — NCLB Specialist — work with LEA</i>	LEA Consolidated Plan Review Procedures Implemented	Self Assessment Preparation for On Site Visit	On Site Visit	Follow up Deficiencies deadline agreed upon

Suggestions:

- ❑ Change Corrective Action (Year 6) to Deficiencies Corrections
- ❑ Look at the Accreditation Process in development of NCLB monitoring cycle
- ❑ Making sure that steps are being taken all through the cycle that LEAs are meeting the 5 goals of NCLB.
- ❑ ADE contact ASBA when policies and procedures need to be changed. This would help small districts with limited legal budgets. A reminder was made that LEAs cannot just adopt ASBA policies but should use them as a guideline. They also need to be sure to have parents involved on the development of the Title I LEA Parent Policy.

Concerns:

- ❑ A big concern of members is that a joint monitoring where multiple programs such as ESS and NCLB are monitored at the same time would have an adverse impact on smaller districts and Charter schools where one individual wears many hats.